

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 412 848

HE 030 639

AUTHOR Shirley, Robert C.
TITLE Strategic and Operational Reform in Public Higher Education:
A Mandate for Change. AGB Occasional Paper No. 21.
INSTITUTION Association of Governing Boards of Universities and
Colleges, Washington, DC.
SPONS AGENCY Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association, New York, NY.
College Retirement Equities Fund.
PUB DATE 1994-00-00
NOTE 17p.
AVAILABLE FROM Association of Governing Boards of Universities and
Colleges, One Dupont Circle, Suite 400, Washington, DC 20036
(members, \$4.95; nonmembers, \$9.95; quantity discounts).
PUB TYPE Opinion Papers (120)
EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Change Strategies; Competition; Decision Making;
Educational Change; Educational Planning; Governance;
Governing Boards; Higher Education; Institutional
Characteristics; Institutional Mission; Long Range Planning;
Needs Assessment; *Organizational Objectives; *Public
Colleges; *Strategic Planning; Trustees

ABSTRACT

This paper proposes approaches for both strategic and operational reform and restructuring of higher education. An approach to strategic decision making requires a detailed examination of mission, clientele, programs, competitiveness, and strategic objectives. There are operational efficiencies that institutions can obtain with the proper discipline and commitment. The reform process has a role for trustees. Strategic decision making begins with answering five essential questions concerning: (1) the fundamental mission of the institution; (2) the clientele and their primary needs; (3) programs needed to meet these needs and prioritization; (4) identification of distinguishing characteristics of the institution which offer a competitive edge over other institutions; and (5) identification of the institution's strategic objectives. Decisions regarding future plans in these five areas depend on consideration of external influences, internal capabilities, and culture of the institution. Identifying and setting priorities occur at the university-wide and program-specific levels. Operational reform is concerned with how institutional changes are made such as the most appropriate approach to downsizing in a particular environment. (JLS)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *



Association of Governing Boards
of Universities and Colleges

**Strategic and Operational Reform
in Public Higher Education:
A Mandate for Change**

By Robert C. Shirley

AGB OCCASIONAL PAPER No. 21

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1AE 030 639

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL
IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AGB

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

* Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

The AGB Occasional Paper Series addresses current and emerging issues of concern to board members and administrators in the context of their institutional settings. Written by acknowledged experts, AGB's Occasional Papers focus on educational and governance trends that affect boards and administrators.

AGB distributes new titles in the Occasional Paper Series as they are published to chief executives and board chairs of member institutions. Additional copies are available at a nominal charge by calling or writing to AGB.

Copyright 1994 Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, One Dupont Circle, Suite 400, Washington, D.C. 20036. All rights reserved.

This paper was produced with a grant from TIAA-CREF. It is part of AGB's strategic policy initiative, which is supported by the Robert W. Woodruff Foundation.



Association of Governing Boards
of Colleges and Universities
One Dupont Circle • Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036

Tel: 202/296-8400 Fax: 202/223-7053

Strategic and Operational Reform in Public Higher Education: A Mandate for Change

By Robert C. Shirley

We are privileged to be a part of the greatest system of higher education in the world, as measured by both qualitative and quantitative attainments. A principal reason for that greatness has been our ability to change and, when necessary, to respond boldly to external and internal challenges. We must continue this commitment to bold change in order to face the new economic and political realities confronting higher education.

A task of great magnitude lies before us: to accomplish the reforms within our institutions of higher learning necessary to meet the challenges of the coming decades. I hope this paper stimulates new ways of thinking about both strategic and operational reform within our nation's public institutions. Many of the thoughts here also apply to independent colleges and universities. In any case, trustees and senior administrators must provide the leadership for initiating and implementing forward-thinking reform efforts.

Pressures for Reform. Every generation, no doubt, believes its era is the most challenging of all. Still, it is difficult to imagine that the external forces affecting higher education ever have posed greater demands than they do today. Such forces challenge all aspects of institutional functioning, including what and how we teach. Responding to today's global challenges requires reexamining the whole—that is, rethinking both the content and pedagogy of our general education programs as well as the specific requirements for majors in various fields. As Paul M. Kennedy states in a 1993 essay, "Preparing for the Twenty-First Century,"

I'm not sure whether we have properly reconsidered our curriculum, with its heavy emphasis upon traditional disciplinary boundaries and ever greater specialization.... In this fractured world of ours, where experts now predict that our biggest future challenge will be the coming clash of civilizations, we must trade off restrictions for restructures; we must rethink civilization and expand our curricula to embrace the globe.

While massive political and cultural forces are at work on the large scale, higher education institutions are increasingly buffeted by winds of change at the local and regional level as well. Most notable are the economic and political forces associated with rising tuition and the occasional well-publicized lapses in managerial judgment (for example, improper use of indirect-cost monies). Most public discontent with higher education focuses on the wallet. "It is higher education's cost that the public frets most about," notes the November 1993 issue of *Policy Perspectives*, summarizing the Pew Charitable Trusts' Higher Education Roundtable discussions. "Public opinion

polls in fact echo little of the media's focus on faculty or institutions that don't work, little of the worry about how colleges and universities actually go about their business."

Public disenchantment with costs and managerial irresponsibility is soon reflected in state capitals, of course, and this often leads to pressures for greater accountability and, in particular, for cost containment. These economic and political pressures have reached such heights that higher education institutions—public and private alike—must respond with significant institutional reform efforts. As Graham T.T. Molitor states in a 1993 essay:

Public sector institutions, especially colleges and universities, are increasingly feeling pressure to undertake down-sizing, out-sourcing, cost cutting, and accountability in productivity, standards, and results-oriented outcomes.... Economic hard times always usher in harsh reforms. Periodic revamping is an essential component of change processes.... Doing more with less will be a byword of the politicians through the 1990s.

Internal pressures for major reforms also are intense. As Andrea K. Wilger and William F. Massy note in the November 1993 *Policy Perspectives*:

What was once almost automatic—travel funds, equipment money, research start up funds, money to nurture projects until they were funded by external sources, and money to support faculty research programs between grants—is now relentlessly competitive or, worse yet, has disappeared all together. Faculty, used to competing externally for grants and publication opportunities, now must compete against their institutional and departmental colleagues for scarce internal money.

In short, then, today's economic and political pressures, coupled with the need for investment in new opportunities and high-priority programs, necessitate both strategic and operational reform within our institutions.

As to strategic reform, we need to articulate institutional mission in a more focused manner, state clear and explicit priorities for the future, reduce both the scale and scope of academic programs and administrative activities, and reallocate funds to our highest priority endeavors. But there is also the need for a strong operational emphasis. That is, institutions not only need to develop an explicit strategic focus for the future but also to engage in administrative downsizing and, in general, operate much more efficiently. Thus, we must do more than ensure that we are *doing the right things*—a matter of strategic decision making. We must also ensure that we are *doing things right*—a matter of operational reform in pursuit of greater efficiency.

This paper proposes approaches for both strategic and operational reform and restructuring. First, it presents an approach to strategic decision making that requires detailed examination of mission, clientele, programs,

competitiveness, and strategic objectives. Following this are some thoughts about operational efficiencies that our institutions can attain with the proper discipline and commitment. Finally, we will examine some considerations of the reform process, with special emphasis on the role of trustees.

Strategic Decision Making. True restructuring efforts in higher education must begin by focusing on five strategic questions:

- What is the fundamental mission of our institution?
- Who are (or should be) our clientele, and what are their primary needs?
- What programs are necessary to meet our clientele's needs, and what should be our highest priority endeavors?
- What distinguishing characteristics of our institution enable us to establish a competitive advantage in relation to other institutions?
- What strategic objectives should we pursue to move from where we are now to where we want to be?

These five questions, once answered, establish the strategic position of a college or university in the overall educational, political, economic, and demographic environment. Once the strategic position is made clear, then—and only then—may issues of operational efficiencies be addressed, simply because such efficiencies must be implemented within the overall strategic context, to support established priorities.

Let us examine each of the five strategic decision areas:

1. Institutional mission. Articulating institutional mission requires detailed consideration of the desired nature, shape, and character of the institution. This involves addressing such issues as the fundamental purposes of the institution; the geographic scope of its activities; the special traditions, characteristics, and values that are to be cultivated and nurtured; the relative emphasis on teaching, research, and service; the relative emphasis on graduate and undergraduate education; the general types and levels of academic programs appropriate to the future; the form of governance and style of management that should characterize the institution; and the overall community and civic obligations that the institution intends to assume. In short, the mission statement proclaims the vision and aspirations of the institution. The statement should be specific, communicating guiding principles for behavior to all members of the institution. Without such specificity, mission statements will remain vague and useless in setting the tone for institutional development.

2. Clientele targets. As part of strategic reform, institutions need to explicitly identify the target audiences they serve. Far too many institutions are trying to be "all things to all people," even though resource limitations require them to concentrate in fewer areas. Using the mission statement as the backdrop, a public institution in particular must establish priorities

among the vast range of clientele the institution legitimately could serve. For example, a regional university exists primarily to serve the needs of the region's population. Yet a single university cannot possibly hope to respond to *all* the educational, cultural, and economic needs of its service area, even when operating in concert with other agencies and institutions. Thus, it must establish priorities that reflect the types and numbers of clientele the institution can serve effectively.

3. *Program offerings and priorities.* The failure to limit the range and number of clientele has led, in many institutions, to program proliferation. Simply stated, most colleges and universities today offer far more programs, both academic and administrative, than is academically and economically sound. Consequently, strategic reform requires an institution to determine the specific academic programs and administrative functions vital to its future, given its mission and the needs of the clientele. Further, bold decisions must be made about the relative priorities among programs, a matter discussed more fully below. Hard economic times demand that we address these issues squarely and without timidity, despite the inevitable sensitivities and tensions that surround the process.

4. *Comparative advantage.* Every institution should attempt to identify distinguishing characteristics that allow it to develop a competitive advantage in the market place. Examples are quality of faculty in a specific program, geographical advantage, access to a particular facility that may be unavailable to others, a low student-faculty ratio, and a pleasing campus environment. To have the desired effects on enrollment and other facets of institutional vitality, the institution should nurture those distinguishing characteristics that match the needs of the clientele to be served. The healthiest type of competition occurs when institutions seek to develop unique "strategic positions" within the larger educational and political environment. Society benefits from the resulting differentiation of institutions, as a broader array of choices and experiences becomes available.

5. *Strategic objectives.* The final decision point in strategic reform is to identify the strategic objectives that will enable the institution to fulfill its mission, deliver appropriate services to targeted audiences, implement program offerings and priorities to meet the needs of the clientele, and achieve an overall comparative advantage. These objectives constitute the major actions required to move from the present state of affairs to the planned condition. Such actions typically identify the "points of movement" necessary throughout the institution in order to effectively implement the newly defined strategic vision.

Key Inputs to the Strategic Vision. Decisions about future strategic positioning in these five areas depend heavily on careful deliberation of three crucial types of inputs: external influences, internal capabilities, and the values and culture of the institution. Any strategic vision needs to "match," as much as possible, these three key inputs.

Assessment of the external environment should identify both the positive influences (opportunities) and the negative ones (threats and constraints). Economic, demographic, political, legal, technological, and social forces should be examined in some detail to determine their potential impact on the college or university. Every analysis prepared concerning a major external influence should identify the specific implications for strategic decision making in the five areas identified above. These days, political forces deserve particular emphasis as public institutions struggle to determine feasible courses of action when faced with conflicting signals from legislators, such as directives to maintain quality while holding tuition increases to a minimum.

The analysis of internal capabilities usually focuses on human capital, financial resources, facilities, existing programs, image, and the overall climate of the institution. As in the case of external influences, the implications of the findings for strategic reform should be specifically identified.

Finally, the values and culture of the organization should be given explicit attention to ensure that the strategic vision is reasonably consistent with the mores, customs, and ideals of the institution and its members. Values are especially vital in determining what groups and individuals "want to do" as the institution moves through time. And commitment to the strategic vision is crucial to its successful realization.

Setting Priorities. One point that keeps recurring in this discussion is the need to identify priorities. In fact, priority-setting occurs on many levels and is an integral part of the process of strategic reform. In general, there are two types of strategic priorities: *universitywide* and *program specific*. Setting universitywide priorities requires establishing an order of importance among the strategic objectives deemed necessary to achieve the overall vision of the institution. Most strategic objectives require significant resource commitments. Resource limitations typically preclude simultaneous pursuit of a large number of strategic objectives; consequently, setting priorities becomes important. Campus leaders may need to choose among, for instance, restructuring of the general education curriculum, faculty salary increases, or campus beautification.

Setting program-specific priorities involves, as mentioned earlier, identifying the academic and administrative programs to be enhanced, maintained, reduced, or eliminated. This component of the overall strategic-reform effort is perhaps the most difficult of all, both intellectually and emotionally. However, it also is the most important decision issue, in that it has the greatest implications for the institution's use of resources and its ability to serve the needs of targeted clientele.

We must do more than ensure that we are doing the right things—a matter of strategic decision making. We must also ensure that we are doing things right—a matter of operational reform in pursuit of greater efficiency.

The process of setting program-specific priorities typically begins by categorizing programs as academic, administrative, and student services/athletics. Criteria are then developed to guide the review of all existing programs and activities. In the case of academic programs, typical criteria include the centrality of the program to institutional mission, the quality of faculty, availability of (or access to) sufficient library resources, the quality and quantity of facilities and equipment, the program's connections to other academic areas, student demand for the program, demand for graduates majoring in the program, locational advantage, competitive vitality, effect of the program on the external community, and costs of the program in relation to revenues generated through state funding, tuition, and other sources.

Because of the wide differences in purpose and form that characterize nonacademic endeavors, criteria for reviewing administrative functions and student services/athletics are usually more broadly stated. Four typical points include the activity's centrality to institutional mission, quality of the activity, need for the activity, and cost-effectiveness.

Using such criteria, reviews of all existing programs and functions generally are conducted by broadly constituted task forces composed of faculty, staff, students, and often community representatives, all of whom ideally abandon the tendency to "protect their own turf." A separate group often is established to ascertain new programmatic opportunities based on the assessment of the external environment and the evaluation of institutional capabilities and values.

The process of setting priorities is essential in achieving overall strategic reform. The challenge lies less in technique than in mustering the institutional will to face the new realities and to make the hard decisions necessary for strategic renewal.

All these groups have a common purpose of identifying the appropriate programmatic scope of the institution for the future. Clearly, today's economic and political environment demands *focus and boldness* in articulating programmatic scope. Institutions not willing to confront the challenge of eliminating programs are unlikely to generate the resources they need either to invest in new opportunities or to enhance existing programs.

In summary, the process of setting priorities is essential in achieving overall strategic reform. The challenge lies less in technique than in mustering the institutional will to face the new realities and to make the hard decisions necessary for strategic renewal.

Operational Reform. While strategic decision making focuses on *what* an institution should be doing, operational reform efforts are more concerned with *how* it is done. More often than not, American institutions of higher learning are overadministered. They have fallen prey to "administrative creep" and have failed, in most cases, to avoid excessive bureaucracy.

This is not to say that administrators and other support personnel do not work long hours in support of the academic purposes of the enterprise. But it comes down to a matter of choice: Do we seek, in these economic and political times, to invest as many dollars as possible in the classroom and laboratory? Or do we continue to maintain or even to expand our nonacademic support services? Certainly there are pressures, both external and internal, that mandate the expenditure of funds on administrative matters. But no longer can most institutions afford an ever-expanding corps of vice presidents and support-staff members.

Three areas, in particular, are key to operational reform: (1) administrative downsizing, (2) increasing the productivity of the learning process, and (3) forming partnerships with other agencies and institutions to make better use of taxpayer dollars. Operational reform in each of these areas can result in significant savings, which, in turn, can be reallocated to academic programs and services more closely connected to students' needs.

- *Administrative downsizing.* In our discussion of priority-setting, we noted that all administrative functions should be subjected to four tests: Is the function central to the primary mission of the institution? Is the function or office operating at appropriate levels of quality? Is there a demonstrable need for the services produced by the administrative office or function? And, finally, is the office or function operating in a cost-effective manner? The specific measurements employed to gauge effectiveness of administrative functions in these four areas will vary dramatically, of course, as there is little similarity between the internal workings of, for example, accounting and admissions. But the specific measures for each office can and should be identified to assess whether the unit is staffed and funded appropriately. And this evaluation *must* be done with a bias toward identifying all possible ways of reducing the scale and scope of the administrative function.

One underused method for achieving significant savings is the formation of internal partnerships and cross-training of personnel. Just as academic programs in many instances have become overly specialized and insular, so too have administrative offices built unwarranted barriers around their respective areas of operation. Cross-training personnel so that staff can be shared during peak periods of activity in various areas—such as registration and disbursement of student payroll checks—can bring significant dollar savings. Similarly, secretarial pools, although perhaps unappealing to status-conscious administrators, can save money without serious loss of effectiveness. As yet another example, campus leaders seeking to reduce the administrative force should be on the alert for ways to subcontract specialized areas of activity to outside vendors.

Each of the above points of examination, and even the call for a bias toward administrative downsizing, can be subjected to interminable debate about advantages and disadvantages. The fundamental point is that while there are demonstrable disadvantages and even potential negative effects

from reducing the overall size of administration, the benefits to be gained are far greater. Educational benefits are demonstrable in that resources can be put closer to the accomplishment of the college or university's primary purposes. And public institutions enjoy a not inconsequential political benefit, as members of both the legislative and executive branches of government generally strongly support such resource-reallocation efforts.

• *Productive Learning.* In a 1993 paper, "Learning Productivity—A New Imperative for Higher Education," D. Bruce Johnstone, former chancellor of the State University of New York, argues persuasively that productivity of higher education (student success and cost containment) will depend not on more productive teaching, but on more productive learning—for instance, by beginning college-level learning at an earlier age, reducing the time a student spends on activities other than learning (including excessive vacations), minimizing duplicative learning, and lessening the "aimless drift" of students through prolonged undergraduate years.

The benefit of a focus on learning, rather than simply on teaching, is that the unit of analysis is clearly the *student*, rather than such "factors of production" as facilities, equipment, or faculty. In other words, Johnstone proposes that while economic and political forces are demanding more productivity from all colleges and universities, the challenge is to respond with no diminution of quality. Thus the answer is not in increased work loads, because most faculty and staff already work long hours with commitment and dedication. Rather, the premise is that students, on average, can learn far more in a given span of time than they now do.

Consistent with this premise, Johnstone proposes (1) individually paced "mastery learning," (2) the use of affordable educational technology, (3) discouraging undergraduates from excessive experimentation and "drift," (4) year-round study, (5) making college-level work accessible to students age 16 to 18 through dual credit and other arrangements, (6) entry into graduate and advanced professional education at an earlier age, and (7) redesign of student-aid programs to reduce financial disincentives to year-round study and faster baccalaureate completion. Of course, faculty productivity should, by extension, also show steady improvement as systemic change occurs in the learning process.

Of course, each of Johnstone's basic proposals has certain drawbacks. Clearly, we must seek a balance between, at one extreme, unthinking pursuit of a narrow degree with no opportunity for any exploration of alternate pursuits and, at the other, unlimited experimentation in different fields of study. Neither extreme is desirable. But the overarching advantage to all of Johnstone's suggestions lies in bringing greater focus and efficiency to the learning process. His basic premise is, I believe, unassailable: The economic and political times demand more productivity from colleges and universities, and improvements at the margin no longer are sufficient.

Thus, just as an earlier section of this paper called for colleges and universities to demonstrate boldness and risk-taking in their approaches to *strategic* reform, so does Johnstone challenge trustees, faculty, students, and administrators to respond in equally bold fashion in *operational* reform. We must do the right things (make the right strategic choices), but we also must do things right (become more efficient and productive) if we are to completely fulfill our obligations to students, taxpayers, legislators, parents, and other key constituents.

- *Formation of partnerships.* The third element of operational reform requires colleges and universities to begin to think more openly about collaborating with other agencies and organizations. Forming partnerships often means surrendering some independence, but the potential gains far outweigh any minor impact on institutional autonomy. Moreover, most operational reform efforts promise only greater efficiencies; the formation of collaborative partnerships portends gains in effectiveness as well.

While there are demonstrable disadvantages and even potential negative effects from reducing the overall size of administration, the benefits to be gained are far greater.

Alan Ostar, former president of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, coined the term "interactive universities" to describe the philosophy underlying this particular initiative. Simply stated, universities of all types—research institutions, regional universities, private liberal arts colleges, and others—need to become more actively involved with the environments in which they exist. Such interaction should be highly aggressive and proactive and not occur merely in response to requests for assistance or political expedience. Where such interactions reinforce educational mission, all parties stand to gain—especially students.

The increasing emphasis on service learning in our society is but one manifestation of this philosophy. Other examples include joint research ventures with industry, school-college collaborations, field projects and internships, joint sponsorship of cultural offerings with community-based groups, and various forms of collaboration with governmental agencies, whether local, regional, national, or international.

If an institution is to create significant reform in *how* it fulfills its mission and meets the needs of its clientele, then it must be willing to share resources with other organizations in the pursuit of common ends. For example, the University of Southern Colorado, a public regional university with 5,000 students, recently forged an alliance with the region's largest school district, District 60, which has 18,000 students and 1,100 teachers. Under this alliance, each institution retains its legal and financial identity, but both have agreed contractually to implement many joint efforts designed to increase student achievement and enhance operational efficiencies.

Much is happening to join the institutions educationally, but the most significant achievements in operational reform so far have been in administrative and support activities—in some cases, entailing the full consolidation of administrative activities. For example, the print shops of the two institutions have merged, bringing significant annual savings and enabling them to avoid duplicating their investment in expensive equipment. The purchasing offices have merged with similar results. The institutions now share the services of one executive director of physical plant, not only to save money but also to realize the benefits of a noncompartmentalized view of “one grand educational plant.” And the list goes on. The bottom line: Dollar savings from these consolidations have been reallocated to strengthen the academic programs of both institutions.

Implementation of partnerships such as this requires openness and flexibility in dealing with change. Suspicions exist on both sides of the partnerships, as individuals protect old turfs and attempt to ensure that the “other side” is not realizing greater benefits. In other words, the competitive instinct is often more dominant than one’s inclination toward collaboration.

This tendency in particular makes leadership from trustees and presidents essential to successful operational reform. There is no doubt that forming partnerships requires significant behavioral changes, which many people will resist. Presidents and trustees must give both verbal and financial support to create the proper climate for such changes. Unwavering commitment to the ideal of collaboration and resource-sharing must be obvious. Rewards and incentives for change also should be developed so that those most dramatically affected reap at least a portion of the gains.

I noted earlier that both strategic and operational reforms are made necessary by today’s economic and political climate. Since strategic reform provides directional signals and focuses on *what* an institution should be doing, institutional leaders must address strategic changes before discussing operational changes. However, operational reform—the focus on the *how*—is essential to achieving the cost containment being demanded by students, parents, taxpayers, and legislators. Bold actions in this area also offer potential economic gains (through reallocation) for academic programs.

But gains through operational reform will not be realized through “tweaking” existing paradigms of administrative activity. To implement change of the magnitude called for here, we cannot simply revise old pages; we must write new ones. It is with this in mind that I present administrative downsizing, increased productivity in learning, and formation of partnerships as key areas for significant operational reform.

Implementing Successful Reform Efforts. These kinds of strategic and operational reforms require massive organizational change efforts. To ensure successful implementation, several conditions must be satisfied.

1. *The process must involve all affected parties—especially faculty.* Ideally, trustees, faculty, staff, and students would work together to effect successful strategic and operational reform, but it is essential that the tone first be set by trustees and the president. Because of their strong policy orientation, trustees usually should be more concerned with issues of strategic reform than operational matters. Still, trustees also must strongly encourage significant operational reform, even though they may not be directly involved in its design. It is incumbent upon presidents to design, in concert with appropriate constituents, the appropriate process for pursuing both strategic and operational reform. To give strong and visible endorsement of such large-scale efforts, the process should be approved formally by trustees.

2. *The endorsement of faculty opinion leaders is essential.* Such endorsement sometimes is difficult to gain, as previous false starts at many institutions cause even the "best" faculty to be understandably suspicious of highly promoted reform efforts. Here again, trustees and the president play an integral role in convincing such faculty to be visibly and actively involved.

3. *Successful reform requires operating on a narrower front, both academically and administratively.* This guiding principle should permeate all efforts at strategic and operational reform. If, indeed, future investment in high-priority activities is to proceed simultaneously with overall cost containment. It no longer is possible to meet the vast array of constituents' needs that colleges and universities have assumed over time. Thus, successful downsizing—or "rightsizing"—depends on a commitment to this guiding principle from the outset.

4. *Political support from lawmakers is essential.* In the case of public institutions, it is necessary that legislative leaders understand and support bold and high-risk reform efforts through "hold harmless" provisions and other mechanisms. Otherwise, public institutions are extremely vulnerable to the efforts of naysayers who will attempt to forestall any efforts to implement change.

5. *Finally, successful change of the magnitude desired will occur only if the process is undergirded by an unwavering commitment to make the hard choices necessary to cut administrative costs and, more important, to put our obligations to students and taxpayers ahead of our obligations to any individual faculty, administrator, or staff member.* Promising reform efforts too often stall when the individual ramifications of programmatic and structural change become evident. We must stick to the high road and ensure that the greater good for the greater number remains our primary goal. Pursuit of that goal often requires individual dislocations, and this creates delicate situations that must be handled humanely and sensitively. But these never should be at the cost of large-scale reform. Our primary obligation in such efforts is not to those who serve, but rather to those who are served.

This paper has issued a call for both strategic and operational reform in higher education. No precise formula exists to determine when such massive change efforts are required. But the signs are increasingly clear. Most colleges and universities are unable to fund the salary increases necessary to reward outstanding performance. Deferred maintenance continues to present a major problem for most institutions. State appropriations rarely achieve inflationary levels, leading to further erosion of quality. "Good people" frequently are spread far too thin to discharge properly their responsibilities. And, in general, we are threatened by a rising tide of mediocrity as a result of our inability to solve these funding problems and at the same time meet the public demand for cost containment.

Rather than continue in a defensive survival mode, we need to pursue the strategic and operational reform efforts that promise to instill a new sense of spirit and vigor in the academic enterprise. Let us join together—trustees, faculty, staff, students, and administrators—to forge this new spirit. Let us not miss the opportunity to be genuinely responsive to the needs of our publics and to create innovative reforms.

About the Author

Robert C. Shirley has been president of the University of Southern Colorado since 1984. Since 1980, Shirley has conducted training seminars for college and university executives throughout the United States and has served as a consultant in strategic planning and management to more than 150 colleges and universities.

Before arriving at USC, he served for three years as a professor and chair of the department of business administration at Trinity University in San Antonio, Tex. Prior to that appointment, he was associate professor of management at Central University of Iowa and associate professor of business at the State University of New York in Albany. He also served as assistant to the president and as associate vice president for academic affairs at SUNY.

He earned his bachelor's and master's degrees in business administration at the University of Houston and his Ph.D. in business policy and systems analysis at Northwestern University in Evanston, Ill.

The AGB Occasional Paper Series

1. **Emerging Policy Issues for Community Colleges**
By Louis W. Bender
2. **Emerging Policy Issues for State Coordinating Boards**
By Patrick M. Callan
3. **Emerging Policy Issues for Public Multicampus Systems**
By Aims C. McGuinness Jr.
4. **Emerging Policy Issues for Foundations of Public Institutions**
By Royster C. Hedgepeth
5. **Emerging Policy Issues for Single-Campus Public Institutions**
By Kenneth P. Mortimer
6. **Emerging Policy Issues for Historically Black Institutions**
By Alan H. Kirschner
7. **Emerging Policy Issues for Theological Schools and Seminaries**
By Christa R. Klein
8. **Emerging Policy Issues for Church-Related Institutions**
By The Reverend William McInnes
9. **Emerging Policy Issues for Private Research Universities**
By Roger L. Geiger
10. **Emerging Policy Issues for Liberal Arts Colleges**
By Kathryn Mohrman
11. **Information Systems for Board of Theological Seminaries**
By Lawrence M. Butler
12. **Achieving Integrity in Intercollegiate Athletics**
By Wilford S. Bailey
13. **Policies for Improving Trustee Selection in the Public Sector**
By Patrick M. Callan and Dean A. Honetschlager
14. **Emerging Issues in Independent School (K-12) Governance**
By Pearl R. Kane
15. **Tuition and Finance Issues for Public Institutions**
By Thomas P. Wallace, Darryl J. Greer, and James R. Mingle
16. **Issues of Athletic Certification for NCAA Division I Members**
By Maureen E. Devlin
17. **Long-Term Tuition Policy: What Happens When Tuition Rises
Faster Than Ability to Pay?**
By John A. Dunn Jr.
18. **"New Partnering" for Higher Education and the Corporate Sector**
By Delwin A. Roy
19. **Board Effectiveness in Theological Schools**
By Barbara E. Taylor and Christa R. Klein
20. **A Prescription for Vitality for Small, Private Colleges**
By Ruth B. Cowan
21. **Strategic and Operational Reform in Public Higher Education:
A Mandate for Change**
By Robert C. Shirley
22. **Higher Education: On a Collision Course With New Realities**
By David W. Breneman

All titles in this series are available at modest prices from AGB Publications, 202/296-8400.

Individuals affiliated with AGB-member institutions may photocopy and distribute copies of this paper. If you would like additional copies bound in this format, please use this order form or call AGB Publications at 202/296-8400.

Individual copies cost \$4 each. For orders less than \$25, please add \$3 for shipping and handling. For orders \$25-\$50, please add \$5. For orders \$50-\$100, add \$7. For orders larger than \$100, we ship for free.

Occasional Paper Number	How many copies?	Cost
Shipping		
Total		

Name _____

Address _____

City, State, Zip _____

Phone _____

Mail to AGB Publications, One Dupont Circle, Suite 400, Washington, D.C. 20036.
Questions? Call 202/296-8400.

If your order totals \$25 or more, we can bill you. Simply mail this form to AGB or fax it to 202-223-7053.